I informed the Supt. that I should have between four & five hundred dollars in Gold more than necessary to make up my ac/: without requiring any wastage - & that I could I believed point out to whome it belonged. And offered to show the Dr my books & the way in which he makes mistakes - ~~He reported on one deposit of [illegible] an aver-age of [illegible] - now I dont believe such a case will ever occur that melting a number of pigs of~~ silver of ~~different quality of silver that the melts will all give the same quantity of gold.~~ —

all this talk about irregular numbering ~~&c~~ would not have been hinted at but for the information I gave Mr Bradford. The only thing that the Dr might object to which has been done by me & which I informed him of & which was not done without the consent of the Superintendent - was the dividing of melts that there might be two assays - In regard to my ~~leading~~ trying to lead him astray, I should be glad you would require an explination from him - for if that be true I am ~~unfit~~ acting dishonestly & should be turned out of Office immedially

90

Copy
April 27/39
To
Director

Branch of the Mint of the U States.
N. Orleans April 27th 1839

Doctor R. M. Patterson,
Director of the U.S. Mint.

Sir

I have found on reading over the copy of my letter to you, of the 24th inst., that it will be necessary for me to give some further explination, that you may be more fully informed in regard to our difficulties. - You may be at a loss to know what has become of the report for the deposite no 100, if no 100 was changed to no 98; as it will be necessary to have vouchers for every deposite. - The deposite of french crowns & hammered dollars spoken of in my former letter, being two nos. were by direction of the Weigher marked No 1 & 2 of 99 (who puts in the boxes of coins or other bullion sent out to be melted the numbers. - I have always objected to this way of numbering & proposed the method adopted at the principal Mint of continuing the numbers - it has been some times followed but owing to the frequent changes in the clerk of the way room it has been droped, ~~they taking so little interest in their business that it has been difficult to have any thing done right~~. - being in the weigh-room at the time the deposite of F. C. & H. dollars was brought in, I pointed out to him, how much better it would be to continue the numbers - he agreed with me & accordingly had no 2 of 99 stamped 100 - There were two bars of No 99 & one of 100 - He managed to have an assay taken from each of the bars - And sent up to the Assayer two Assayer's blank reports, one No. 1 & 2 of 99 with the wt of F. Crowns & H. dollars and the other No 100 with the wt. of the Mexican dollars in dispute: The Weigher remarked at the time I told him the bullion of report No 98 was not among the bullion then about to be delivered - the weight of deposite No 98 is wrong, it should be 173 ozs some dec. (the wt of $200 the amt said by him to have been deposited) instead of 183 ozs some dec. although he had paid the deposite in small change, which was reported to be 212 $ or thereabouts - I said if that be the case, it is a singular coincidence that the same mistake should occur after as befor melting, his answer was that the weights remained in the scale until it was melted & as it weighed the same he did not think it necessary to examine the weights - again, two deposites of $100 each (mexican dollars) had been made before this & had been put in the Treasurers vault without melting, as proposed by the Superintendent saying that it agreed with the views of the assayer, (as mentioned in my letter of 24 inst) in regard to deposites of mexican dollars. —

"The following is from the report of the Assayer to the Superintendent. "My Opinion then is that the Melter & Refiner is clearly exonerated & sustained in one of his positions in reference to Casas' deposite,* and that the error excists in the Treasurers department. That the irregular numbering inevitably lead me into error, & most probably produced the mistake in the Treasurers department; but that in reference to the other position of the M & R, that he never melted the said deposite of Casas, I am inclined to believe that he did receive & melt that deposite, because how otherwise would the weight *after melting* appear in the weighing book? — Furthermore I am constrained to say that I firmly believe that the M & R has repeatedly endeavoured to lead me into error, so as to afford ground for accusation & my dismissal from office - I have ample testimony to establish this point, but will select a single case by way of illustration: In the month of July last when Mr Lillie was clerk in the Treasurers office, there occured great irregularity & confusion in the entries in the silver weighing-book - I fortunately discovered it & requested Mr Durel the chief clerk to speak to the M & R on the subject - his reply was that he had nothing to do with it & that I might find it out as I could." I do think you will see that the Doctor has to resort to strange argument to sustain his friend Demitry (the weigher) although he thinks

* The depos in dispute.

the deposite in question was not assayed, yet he believes it to have been melted, for how otherwise would the weight after melting appear on the weigh-book - The very thing upon which I found my charge. In regard to the great irregularity & confusion in the entries in the Silver weighing book - I dont believe there is any truth in it, but if there should be, I would ask is the M & R accountable for the mistakes of the Treasurers Clerks, I make no entries in the weighing book, & seldom look into it, except when receiving bullion and as to the numbering the direction always comes from the Weigher - And the Dr discovers great ignorance of my business if he supposes me responsible for the manner in which the clerks discharge their duties - The bullion will be found upon the whole to have lost much less in melting than at the principal mint, and the melting promptly attended to, which I believe is all that is required of me: And as to saying "that he might find out the difficulties as he could", it is false - for I have always shown every disposition to accomodate. - The fact is the Dr makes great mistakes in Assaying for Gold in Silver & he well knows it & unless he can throw the responsibility on some one he is in a bad way. - I have from time to time found out these mistakes, & most fortunately for me they have been in the greatest number of cases in ~~my~~ favour of the Mint - last fall I was at one time very far short in my gold a/c - & again had an excess which I reported to the Superintendent who took no notice of it although I found gold to the am't of $130 in a deposite not reported - which belongs to a house in N.O. & which I ~~[illegible]~~ am sure has never been settled - A few days ago having finished separating

I informed the Supt. that I should have between four & five hundred dollars in gold more than necessary to make up my acct. without requiring any wastage - & that I could I believed point out to whome it belonged. And offered to show the Dr my books & the way in which he makes mistakes - ~~He reported on one deposit of numbers & an aver-age of no - now I dont believe such a case will ever occur that melting a number of pigs of silver of different quality of silver that the melts will all give the same quantity of gold.~~ — all this talk about irregular numbering ~~&c~~ would not have been hinted at but for the information I gave Mr Bradford. The only thing that the Dr might object to which has been done by me & which I informed him of & which was not done without the consent of the Superintendent - was the dividing of melts that there might be two assays - In regard to my ~~leading~~ trying to lead him astray I should be glad you would require an explination from him - for if that be true I am ~~unfit~~ acting dishonestly & should be turned out of Office immedially

90.
Copy
April 27/39
Director